



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,598	02/14/2005	Tatsuo Itabashi	112857-425	8820
29175	7590	10/29/2009		
K&L Gates LLP P. O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690			EXAMINER HARPER, LEON JONATHAN	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/29/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/524,598	Applicant(s) ITABASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner LEON HARPER	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-50, 53 and 54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-50, 53-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/29/09 has been entered. Pursuant to the request claims 51 and 52 have been cancelled. Claims 26-31, 33, 35-37, 39-43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 53 and 54 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 26-50, 53-54 are pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26-50 and 53-54 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2166

Claims 26-27, 35, 38-41, 44-48 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 20020151315 (hereinafter Hendrey).

As for claim 26 Hendrey discloses: a processor (See paragraph 0092)

a memory device which stores instructions (See paragraph 0092) which when executed by the processor cause the processor to perform data communication with an external apparatus (See paragraph 0062) collect information of accessible nearby apparatuses and store the information in a storage means (See paragraphs 0062, 0064)

acquire user information of said processor from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0092 note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines, and See paragraph 108 noting that a location record is created when a MU reports); request a communication service to a service provider based on the acquired user information (See paragraph 0093 note: MU sends the request for services which ultimately end up at the application server, also see paragraph 0096 noting that the database server runs programs that receive request from MUs); and utilize said communication service based on a determination of whether or not said communication service can be provided by said service provider (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results), wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying).

As for claim 27 the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to receive the information of the nearby apparatuses from a space directory (See paragraph 0079), wherein said space directory (a) stores the information of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 108), and (b) updates the information of nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0064).

As for claim 30 the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to periodically collect the information of the accessible nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0098)

As for claim 31 the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to (a) communicate with a personal directory (PDR) which stores original data of the mobile directory information through communication relay means included in the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0096 note the database server stores personal information) , and (b) register the position of the mobile information processor in the personal directory (PDR) (See paragraph 0108).

As for claim 32 Hendrey discloses: a processor (See paragraph 0092) a memory device which stores instructions (See paragraph 0092) which when executed by the

Art Unit: 2166

processor cause the processor to perform data communication with an external apparatus (See paragraph 0062) acquire user information of said processor from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0092 note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines, and See paragraph 108 noting that a location record is created when a MU reports); receive a service request from the external apparatus based on the acquired user information (See paragraph 0093 note: MU sends the request for services which ultimately end up at the application server, also see paragraph 0096 noting that the database server runs programs that receive request from MUs); and provide at least part of the original information as nearby apparatus information to the external apparatus based on a determination of whether or not said communication service can be provided by said service provider, wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying, and See paragraph 0096 note the database server stores personal information).

As for claim 33 the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to register position information of the external apparatus (See paragraph 0108).

Art Unit: 2166

As for claim 34 Hendrey discloses: a processor (See paragraph 0092) a memory device which stores instructions (See paragraph 0092) which when executed by the processor cause the processor to perform data communication with an external apparatus (See paragraph 0062) acquire user information of said processor from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0092 note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines, and See paragraph 108 noting that a location record is created when a MU reports); receive a service request from the external apparatus based on the acquired user information (See paragraph 0093 note: MU sends the request for services which ultimately end up at the application server, also see paragraph 0096 noting that the database server runs programs that receive request from MUs); and provide at least part of the original information as nearby apparatus information to the external apparatus based on a determination of whether or not said communication service can be provided by said service provider, wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying, and See paragraph 0096 note the database server stores personal information).

As for claim 35 Hendrey discloses: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to transmit the information of the information processor about nearby apparatuses to the external apparatus (See paragraphs 0063, 0096).

As for claim 38 Hendrey discloses: a personal directory which (a) acquires user information of said mobile apparatus from a remote user information database based on information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraphs 0020, 0072-0073); (b) receives a service request from the mobile apparatus through a network based on the acquired user information (See paragraph ; 0093)and (c) provides a service to the mobile apparatus based on a determination of whether or not said service request can be provided, wherein the determination is based on said user information provider (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results).

As for claim 39 the rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: a service provider, wherein the service provider provides a second service based on information obtained from the personal directory (See paragraph 0096 note: the moving point server and database server provide different services).

As for claim 40 the rejection of claim 38 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: a space directory server which stores information of information processors in a local area (See paragraph 0096), wherein the space directory server." acquires user information of said space directory from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one nearby apparatus (See paragraph 0092); receives a service request including information of nearby apparatuses from the mobile apparatus based on the acquired user information (See paragraph 0094); and provides a service through the nearby apparatus based on a determination of whether or not said service

Art Unit: 2166

request can be provided, wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results).

As for claim 41 the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: wherein the service providing process is performed through a service provider (See paragraph 0011)

As for claim 44 Hendrey discloses: obtaining information of nearby apparatuses as information of information processors in a local area (See paragraph 0096) the step of obtaining being performed by a mobile apparatus acquiring user information from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0092); and transmitting, based on the acquired user information, a service request including the information of the nearby apparatuses from the mobile apparatus to a personal directory (See paragraphs 0088-0089, 0094), which stores original data of the information of nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0096 note: database server contains attribute information) so that the personal directory provides a service through the nearby apparatus based on a determination of whether or not said service request can be provided (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results), wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying).

Art Unit: 2166

As for claim 45 the rejection of claim 44 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: obtaining the information of the nearby apparatuses is obtained from a space directory server which stores the information of information processors as nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0094).

As for claim 46 the rejection of claim 44 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: transmitting the service request through a service provider (See paragraph 0011).

As for claim 47 Hendrey discloses: obtaining information of nearby apparatuses as information of information processors in a local area directly from the information processor (See paragraph 0096) acquiring user information from a remote .user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0092); and receiving, based on the acquired user information, a service request including the information of the nearby apparatuses from the mobile apparatus (See paragraphs 0088-0089, 0094); the step of receiving being performed by a personal directory which stores original data of the information of nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0096 note: database server maintains original static information) so that the personal directory provides a service through the nearby apparatus based on a determination of whether or not said service request can be provided (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results), wherein the

Art Unit: 2166

determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying).

As for claim 48 the rejection of claim 47 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: which includes receiving the service request through a service provider (See paragraph 0011).

As for claim 53, the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to acquire said user information based on an ID of said processor (See paragraph 0098).

As for claim 54, the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: wherein said nearby apparatuses include a nearby access point (See paragraph 0098).

Art Unit: 2166

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 28-29 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrey as applied to claims 26 and 34 respectively above, and further in view of US 20030028585 (Yeager).

As for claim 28 the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to (a) receive the information of the nearby apparatuses from a space directory (SDR) which stores the information of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0092 note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines, and See paragraph 108 noting that a location record is created when a MU reports).

Hendrey does not disclose: (b) in response to a transmission challenge from the space directory, transmit encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a public-key certificate to the space directory. Yeager however does disclose: in response to a transmission challenge from the space directory, transmit encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a public-key certificate to the space directory (See paragraph 0118). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Yeager into the system of Hendrey. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to the problem of data processing and communication, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Yeager's teaching would enable user's of the Hendrey system to provide of a more efficient peer to peer model between connect user such as the cloud of Henry (See Henry paragraph 0063) Moreover Yeager is designed for use on mobile communications such as phones (See Yeager paragraph 0058).

As for claim 29 the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Hendrey does not disclose wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to perform Bluetooth wireless communication. Yeager However does

Art Unit: 2166

disclose: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to perform Bluetooth wireless communication (See paragraph 0056).

As for claim 36 the rejection of claim 34 is incorporated and further Hendrey does not disclose wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to: before transmitting the information of the information processors about nearby apparatuses perform authentication processing by challenge response; perform challenge transmission; and receive encrypted data of the challenge transmission created by a secret key of the external apparatus and a public-key certificate as a response from the external apparatus. Yeager however does disclose: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to: before transmitting the information of the information processors about nearby apparatuses perform authentication processing by challenge response; perform challenge transmission; and receive encrypted data of the challenge transmission created by a secret key of the external apparatus and a public-key certificate as a response from the external apparatus (See paragraph 0018). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Yeager into the system of Hendrey. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing and communication, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2166

was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Yeager's teaching would enable user's of the Hendrey system to provide of a more efficient peer to peer model between connect user such as the cloud of Henry (See Henry paragraph 0063) Moreover Yeager is designed for use on mobile communications such as phones (See Yeager paragraph 0058).

As for claim 37 the rejection of claim 34 is incorporated and further Hendrey does not disclose wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to perform Bluetooth wireless communication. Yeager however does disclose: wherein when executed by the processor, the instructions cause the processor to perform Bluetooth wireless communication (See paragraph 0056). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Yeager into the system of Hendrey. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing and communication, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Yeager's teaching would enable user's of the Hendrey system to provide of a more efficient peer to peer model between connect user such as the cloud of Henry (See Henry paragraph

Art Unit: 2166

0063) Moreover Yeager is designed for use on mobile communications such as phones

(See Yeager paragraph 0058).

Claims 42-43 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 20020151315 (hereinafter Hendrey) in view of 20030028585 (Yeager).

As for claim 42 Hendrey discloses: accessing a space directory which stores the information of the nearby apparatuses; receiving the information of the nearby apparatuses from the space directory (See paragraph 0092 note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines); acquiring user information from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 108 noting that a location record is created when a MU reports); requesting a communication service to a service provider based on the acquired user information (See paragraphs 0088-0089, 0094); and utilizing said communication service based on a determination of whether or not said communication service can be provided by said service provider (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results), wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying).

Hendrey does not disclose: transmitting, in response to a transmission challenge from the space directory, encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a public-key certificate to the space directory. Yeager however does disclose: transmitting, in response to a transmission challenge from the space directory, encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a

Art Unit: 2166

public-key certificate to the space directory (See paragraph 0118). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Yeager into the system of Hendrey. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to the problem of data processing and communication, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Yeager's teaching would enable users of the Hendrey system to provide a more efficient peer-to-peer model between connected users such as the cloud of Henry (See Henry paragraph 0063). Moreover, Yeager is designed for use on mobile communications such as phones (See Yeager paragraph 0058).

As for claim 43, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated and further Hendrey discloses: communicating with a personal directory which stores original data of the information of nearby apparatuses, so as to register position information of the mobile information processor in the personal directory (See paragraph 0092, note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines, and See paragraph 0096, noting) the moving point data base stores position while the database server stores original data).

As for claim 49 Hendrey discloses: a step of accessing a space directory which stores the information of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 0092 note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines);; a step of receiving the information of the nearby apparatuses from the space directory (See paragraph 0062); a step of acquiring user information from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses (See paragraph 108 noting that a location record is created when a MU reports); a step of requesting a communication service to a service provider based on the acquired user information (See paragraphs 0088-0089, 0094); and a step of utilizing said communication service based on a determination of whether or not said communication service can be provided by said service provider (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results), wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying).

Hendrey does not disclose: a step of transmitting, in response to a transmission challenge from the space directory, encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a public-key certificate to the space directory. Yeager does disclose: a step of transmitting, in response to a transmission challenge from the space directory, encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a public-key certificate to the space directory (See paragraph 0118). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Yeager into the system of Hendrey. The modification would have been obvious because the two

Art Unit: 2166

references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing and communication, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made.

Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Yeager's teaching would enable user's of the Hendrey system to provide of a more efficient peer to peer model between connect user such as the cloud of Henry (See Henry paragraph 0063) Moreover Yeager is designed for use on mobile communications such as phones (See Yeager paragraph 0058).

As for claim 50 Hendrey discloses: a step of accessing an information processor which stores apparatus information (See paragraph 0062, See paragraph 0092 note: the MPC obtains location data and publishes it to other machines) a step of acquiring user information from a remote user information database based on said information of at least one of the nearby apparatuses(See paragraph 108 noting that a location record is created when a MU reports); a step of requesting a communication service to a service provider based on the acquired user information (See paragraphs 0088-0089, 0094); and a step of utilizing said communication service based on a determination of whether or not said communication service can be provided by said service provider (See paragraph 0062 note a query can yield zero results), wherein the determination is based on said user information (See paragraph 0094 note: system runs on within-distance querying).

Art Unit: 2166

Hendrey does not disclose: a step of transmitting, in response to a transmission challenge from the information processor, encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a public- key certificate to the information processor Yeager however does disclose: a step of transmitting, in response to a transmission challenge from the information processor, encrypted data of the challenge created by its own secret key together with a public- key certificate to the information processor (See paragraph 0118). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Yeager into the system of Hendrey. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing and communication, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Yeager's teaching would enable user's of the Hendrey system to provide of a more efficient peer to peer model between connect user such as the cloud of Henry (See Henry paragraph 0063) Moreover Yeager is designed for use on mobile communications such as phones (See Yeager paragraph 0058).

Art Unit: 2166

Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEON HARPER whose telephone number is (571)272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LEON HARPER/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166
October 25, 2009